DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 351 158 RC 018 835

AUTHOR Tippeconnic, John W., III
TITLE The Education of American Indians: Policy, Practice and Future Direction.
PUB DATE [91]
NOTE 29p.; In: Green, Donald E., Ed. and Tonnesen, Thomas V., Ed. American Indians: Social Justice and Public Policy, 1991; see RC 018 834.
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *American Indian Education; Educational History; Educational Policy; *Educational Responsibility; Educational Trends; Elementary Secondary Education; *Federal Indian Relationship; *Government Role; Higher Education; Public Schools; *Relevance (Education)
IDENTIFIERS Bureau of Indian Affairs Schools; Tribally Controlled Schools

ABSTRACT

The nature and problems of American Indian education are quite complex. Factors defining the context of this complexity include differences between schools and standard teaching methods and traditional Indian education; the special federal-Indian relationship; and the small numbers but great cultural diversity of American Indians. A historical analysis focuses on acculturation as the aim of Indian education, the changing role of the federal government, national studies evaluating Indian education, the growing number of Indians in educational leadership positions, and the apparent loss of national interest in Indian education in the face of global problems. An overview of Indian education today highlights enrollment, dropout rates, graduation rates, and educational attainment of Native Americans, as well as data on population, unemployment, and quality of life. Questions about government role revolve around the relative responsibilities of state and federal governments in Indian education, and attempts to transfer Bureau of Indian Affairs schools to public school districts. Other issues in Indian education include the need for cultural relevance, differences between reservation and off-reservation schools, high Indian failure rates in higher education, and the shortage of Indian teachers. National trends that provide opportunities for change are increased attention on at-risk or disadvantaged students, early childhood education, and integrated programs and educational partnerships. (SV)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED351158

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Thomas V. Tonnesen
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

RC018835

THE EDUCATION OF AMERICAN INDIANS: POLICY, PRACTICE AND FUTURE DIRECTION

John W. Tippeconnic III

Arizona State University

The concept of "education" is a powerful tool in our society. Formal education housed in schools provides the dominant society with the means to exert control over the socialization process of young, developing individuals. In the United States, we proclaim pride in living in a democracy based on the principles of equality, freedom and social justice for all. Yet, we know that these democratic concepts are more relevant for some than for others, especially the poor and powerless. Education, especially public education, has been viewed as the instrument in our society to promote American ideals. [1]

Education and schools are very visible in our society. It seems that whenever there are political, economic, social or health problems, education becomes part of the solution. An example is the recent reform movement in education. Since 1983, federal officials, governors, business leaders, politicians and others have joined with educators to raise critical questions about the results of education and to suggest ways to bring about "quality" and "excellence" in teaching and learning. As Ernest Boyer points out, "This is a school reform movement, in short, driven by political and economic interest, not by educational and human ones."[2]

The discussion thus far points out two factors which help define the context in which this chapter will discuss the education of American Indians. [3] First, the formal education of American Indians takes place in schools—institutions that are not part of the Indian culture. Furthermore, formal education uses teaching and learning methods different from traditional means used by Indians. This will not change. Even tribal or Indian-controlled educational efforts are housed in schools.

Second, numerous outside factors influence formal education, helping to shape what goes on in schools. Political, economic and social conditions provide a mixture of forces, multidimensional in nature, that

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

make education a complex and confusing process in our country. As we will see below, this is especially so for American Indians because of the special relationship they have with the federal government, which means that the federal government plays the dominant role in their education.

There is a third factor that is important in understanding the education of American Indians. American Indians represent less than 1 percent of the total United States population. There are more blacks, more Hispanics, and more Asians in this country. Numbers are critical in a democratic system where votes and political pressure often dictate attention and the allocation of resources. Not only are American Indians few in number, but there is great diversity with approximately three hundred different tribes, each with its own cultural identity. At times this diversity prevents unity among American Indians.

The purpose of the chapter is to discuss the education of American Indians from a broad perspective in order to present and discuss information that will give a greater understanding to the complex nature of Indian education. First, some observations based on an analysis of the history of Indian education will be presented. Then, the current status of American Indian education will be discussed. Next, a sampling of population, economic and social data will be presented and discussed in light of selected key issues in the education of American Indians. Finally, the future of Indian education will be presented in an attempt to show the importance of educational equity in the achievement of social justice.

An Analysis of the History of Indian Education

The history of the formal education of American Indians in the United States has been described as "a national tragedy—a national challenge."[4] The intent here is not to provide a detailed history of the education of American Indians,[5] but rather a number of key observations based on an analysis of the history. This will provide the context in which the rest of the chapter will be developed.

A first observation is that formal education was recognized and used early in the history of this country as the means to change the American Indian. Once the idea of extinction was ruled out, the federal government turned to a policy of "civilizing" and Christianizing the American Indian. The teaching of reading and writing, combined with religious instruction, became the practice in education. Schools, including boarding schools, emerged as the institution that would implement this policy. To this day, formal education is viewed as an important

ingredient in resolving the economic, social, health and political problems confronting American Indians.

It must also be noted that assimilation, either forced, through persuasion, or self-directed, has been the dominant and consistent foundation on which educational policy and practice have been realized for American Indians. Regardless of the federal policy toward American Indians, be it treatymaking, removal, reform, termination or self-determination, assimilation has been central to educational practice. The boarding schools of the nineteenth century practiced forced assimilation by taking Indian students from their families and tribal environments and transporting them great distances to institutions that deemphasized "Indianness," utilizing training programs based on learning individualism, sedentary farming, and reading and writing in English.

The reforms in the federal-Indian relationship of the 1930s, spurred by the Meriam Report in 1928,[6] also changed American Indian education. Foremost was a change in educational practice. Day schools instead of boarding schools were emphasized. Bilingual-bicultural approaches were employed. Nevertheless, assimilation continued to be part of the policy, except it was viewed in a more humanistic perspective. Today, the federal policy toward American Indians is one of self-determination. Assimilation continues to be present in our educational approaches, only now American Indian people are somewhat in control of the educational process.

It is clear that the education of American Indians does not take place in isolation, but is dependent on the larger political, social and economic conditions of the United States. For example, the acquisition of land by non-Indians was the primary force behind the federal policies of treatymaking, removal and termination. Education was viewed as a way to facilitate the acceptance of relinquishing land, accepting individual ownership, and assimilating into the mainstream society.

As mentioned earlier, American Indian education has strong ties to the federal government. This connection is based on the special relationship established during the treaty period from 1778 to 1871. Approximately four hundred treaties were entered into between the U.S. government and Indian nations. One hundred twenty of these treaties had provisions that specifically mentioned education.[7] Since the end of treatingmaking in 1871, numerous congressional acts, Supreme Court decisions and executive orders have solidified this special relationship and provided the legal basis for federal responsibility and involvement in the education of Indian people.

This special relationship means that the federal government has played a dominant role in the education of Indian people, especially

those individuals who are federally recognized as tribal members and those who reside on or near reservations. What it also means is that, in general, Indian people look toward the federal government to provide educational services, often to the extent of becoming overly dependent. However, this special relationship has also resulted in a high level of political savvy and sophistication about the federal government. Indian people have become quite knowledgeable and effective in lobbying federal agencies, including Congress.

As we will see later, the number of American Indian students who attend public schools continues to increase yearly; today over 80 percent of Indian students attend public schools. Actually, the policy of having Indian students attend public schools goes back to the 1890s, when the federal government passed legislation subsidizing public schools to educate Indian students. The legislation provided the

> authority [for] the policy of integrating Indians into the white culture, thus establishing the goal of assimilation and the public schools as the vehicle for attaining that goal. It established the precedent of providing subsidies to public schools in order to get them to assume responsibility for Indian education. The Federal subsidy was necessary, both because there was a reluctance on the part of Indians to enter the schools and because the school district was reluctant to assume the extra costs (in many cases the Indian students lived on nontaxable trust land) and problems anticipated with Indian students. The subsidy was, in effect, an inducement which the State or school district was almost always willing to take in exchange for providing a chair and a desk in a classroom for an Indian.[8]

The Johnson-O'Malley Act of 1934[9] further subsidized public education by authorizing the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) to contract with states to provide funds to educate American Indians. In 1950, Congress passed P.L. 81-815 and P.L. 81-874, known as federal impact laws. Although the laws were intended to provide funds to public schools to educate students who lived in areas that felt the impact of federal programs, primarily military bases, American Indian students were included when amendments to the laws were enacted. These laws were viewed as a means of providing payments in lieu of taxes for students living on federal land, including reservations. A fourth piece of legislation that provides federal funds to public schools to educate American Indians is the Indian Education Act of 1972, Title IV of P.L. 92-318, as amended. Title IV, as it is known, provides funds on an entitlement basis to public schools to develop and operate supplemental programs to meet the special educational and culturally related academic needs of Indian students. Title IV was amended in 1988 by P.L. 100-297, which changed the law in a number of ways by, among

other things, allowing BIA schools to receive Title IV funding, and creating gifted and talented centers to serve American Indians.

Federal subsidies clearly have been successful as an incentive for public schools to educate Indian students, so successful that the federal government is questioning its role of providing elementary and secondary schools through the BIA. Whether the BIA will continue to operate a national school system is subject to debate. The BIA proposed, in a 1988 initiative, to "localize the administration of BIA elementary and secondary schools by contracting management to tribes under P.L. 93-638 or to states if the tribes opt not to contract."[10] This of course met strong opposition, especially from Indian tribes. The result has been an effective lobbying effort in a supportive Congress which included in P.L. 100-297 a mandate prohibiting the BIA from terminating, contracting or transferring any BIA school without approval from the appropriate tribal governing body.

There have been a limited number of national studies on the status of Indian education in this country. The Meriam Report is recognized as the first major assessment of the economic, social and educational conditions of the American Indian.[11] The Brophy Report[12] followed in 1966, the Kennedy Report[13] in 1969, the Havighurst Report [14] in 1971, and the report of the American Indian Policy Review Commission[15] in 1976. Although each study would have to be treated separately to ascertain its full focus and treatment of Indian education, it can be said, in general terms, that the condition of Indian education in this country is poor. The Kennedy Report termed both BIA and public school education a "national tragedy."[16] Numerous recommendations emerged from these reports that addressed virtually every aspect of education, e.g., teachers and teaching practices, curriculum, funding, Indian control, bilingual-bicultural education, boarding schools and parental involvement.

There have also been numerous studies of individual programs; most have been evaluative in nature and conducted at the request of Congress. The Title IV programs are an example. Virtually every program authorized in the Indian Education Act has been evaluated. The problem with these efforts is that they often are politically motivated and address how services are delivered and how funds are allocated, rather than focusing on teaching and learning questions. As such, research in Indian education has been very limited, although there appears to be more interest in these questions recently.

Lack of parental involvement also has been a concern throughout the history of Indian education. The national studies mentioned above acknowledged this problem and recommended that more parents be involved in the education of their children. Title IV mandated parental

involvement through a parent committee that would actively participate in the operation of the program. Even with this mandate and other similar efforts, parental involvement continues to be a concern today.

Fortunately, the leadership in Indian education has changed in recent years. Prior to the 1960s and 1970s, the leadership was primarily non-Indian, and decisions were made with little or no involvement from Indian people. The policy of self-determination and the opportunities associated with the Great Society programs in the 1960s resulted in Indian people assuming positions of leadership in Indian education programs at national, state and local levels. However, the bureaucratic structures, especially at the national level, have continued to impede efforts to provide effective leadership to improve the status of Indian education. For example, during the Reagan administration the two top-level jobs in Indian education at the federal level, one in the BIA and the other in the Department of Education, were held by individuals functioning in acting capacities. It was not until 1987 that Indian individuals were selected on a permanent basis to fill these positions.

A final observation based on the history of Indian education is that awareness, interest and concern about the education of Indian people, from a national perspective, seems to be diminishing as the world shrinks during the information age. The education of American Indians appears to be forgotten and insignificant in the larger scheme of things. The recent national reform movement in education is a good example. Since 1983, when *A Nation at Risk*[17] was released, virtually every major professional organization concerned about education has released its own version of what constitutes "excellence and quality" in education. And while governors, federal bureaucrats, business leaders, religious groups and others have joined educators to suggest ways to improve the educational system in our country, a recent review of fourteen reform documents found only one reference to the education of American Indians, the *American Indian/Alaska Native Concerns Study Committee*. Moreover, this reference was only part of a larger report, *. . . And Justice for All,*[18] published by the National Education Association. The failure to consider the educational concerns of American Indians in the findings and recommendations of these reports is even more surprising given the numbers of at-risk American Indian youth. When specific minority groups are mentioned, the focus is primarily on Hispanics or blacks, or even Asians, with American Indians too often grouped under the "other" category.[19]

The Education of American Indians Today

There are over 360,000 American Indians attending elementary and secondary schools today.[20] As Table 1 shows, 82 percent of the total attended public schools in 1987. The number of Indian students in public schools continues to increase, while the number of students in BIA schools has decreased by 8,680 students since 1978.[21]

TABLE 1
STUDENT ENROLLMENT BY TYPE OF SCHOOL, 1978 AND 1987

Type of School	1978	Percent	1987	Percent
Public Schools	215,000	78	298,107	82
Bureau of Indian Affairs	47,000	17	28,810	8
Contract or Tribal Schools	2,500	1	11,180	3
Mission/Private	9,000	3	25,448	7

Sources: Robert J. Havighurst, "Indian Education: Accomplishments of the Last Decade," *Phi Delta Kappan* 62: 5 (January 1981): 329; and Bureau of Indian Affairs, *United States Department of the Interior Budget Justification, FY 1988* (Washington, D.C.: Bureau of Indian Affairs, 1988).

In 1987, the BIA operated 57 boarding schools, 57 day schools, and 14 dormitories where students attended public schools. In addition, the BIA provided funds to support 58 tribal or contract schools. The U.S. Department of Education reported that in 1980 there were 305,730 American Indians attending school; this represented 0.8 percent of the total public elementary and secondary school enrollment for the country. Blacks had the largest minority enrollment with 16.1 percent; Hispanics followed with 8 percent and Asians with 1.9 percent of the minority enrollment.[22]

There were approximately 90,000 American Indians attending colleges and universities in 1986, compared to 76,000 in 1976. Included in the 90,000 are 5,000 Indian students at the graduate level and 1,000 attending professional schools. The majority of American Indians, 56.2 percent, attend public or private two-year institutions.[23] There are 20 tribally controlled community colleges that enroll approximately 4,000 students.[24]

Even though a majority of American Indian students attend local public schools, the federal government continues to play a dominant role in their education. The BIA, housed in the Department of the Interior, and the Department of Education are the two executive branch agencies responsible for the education of American Indians. The BIA has provided educational services since 1870. Currently the BIA operates a national school system, a Johnson-O'Malley program that provides supplemental support for eligible Indian students attending public schools, and a higher education program that includes support for

adult education, three postsecondary schools, tribally controlled community colleges, and a higher education grant program for individual students.

The Department of Education administers a number of programs that benefit American Indians, the most important of which are the programs mandated by the Indian Education Act of 1972. Title IV, as it is commonly known, provides support to public schools, BIA schools, Indian-controlled schools, tribes, Indian organizations, Indian institutions, institutions of higher education, and fellowships to individuals. Impact aid, bilingual education programs, Chapter 1 programs, and vocational and adult education are among other Department of Education programs that benefit American Indian people.

The condition of Indian education today can be demonstrated with selected data:

- 16.2 percent of American Indians, 25 years old and over, living on reservations have completed less than five years of school. The percentage is even higher, 37.4, for the Navajo.[25]
- Fifty-six percent of American Indians, 25 years old and over, are high school graduates. The percentage for the total U.S. population is 66 percent. The percentage decreases to 43.2 percent when considering only reservation Indians.[26]
- Eight percent of American Indians had four or more years of college, compared to 16 percent of the total population.[27]
- The dropout rate for 1980 high school sophomores was 29.2 percent for American Indian and Alaskan natives, compared to 13.6 for the general public. The dropout rate for Hispanics was 18, for blacks it was 17, for whites it was 12.2, and for Asian Americans it was 3.1.[28]
- Among American Indians, the college dropout rate ranged from 45 percent to 62 percent.[29]

A recent survey of a national sample of Indian educators attempted to gain some understanding about their thinking concerning the current status of Indian education. The survey was similar to the Gallup Poll on the public's attitudes toward the public schools that is conducted each year.[30] Respondents were asked the following question: "Would you say that the education of American Indians, from a national point of view, has improved, gotten worse, or stayed the same during the past five years?"

Thirty-five percent indicated that the education of American Indians had improved over the past five years, 33.3 percent said it had gotten worse, 28.1 percent said it had remained the same, and 3.5 percent

did not know. The same question was asked from a state point of view. Again, 35.1 percent indicated the education of American Indians had improved at their state level, 22.8 percent said it had gotten worse, 36.8 percent said it had stayed the same, and 5.3 percent did not know.[31]

It was also asked, "How has Indian education fared under the Reagan administration?" Seventy percent said that Indian education had fared "poorly" under the Reagan administration, 14 percent indicated "fair," 12.3 percent said "no change," and 3.5 percent said "good." The results are not surprising given that the education of American Indians is tied to the federal government. The respondents were more critical of the Reagan administration than of what was going on in general nationally, or in their states.[32]

Population Data

Population figures for American Indians differ according to who is doing the counting and the definition of "Indian." For example, two common sources of population data are the BIA and the Bureau of the Census, but both reflect different counts based on dissimilar ways of defining American Indians. The BIA estimated it provided services to 755,201 American Indians in 1983. The BIA's definition of Indian includes those from one of the 291 federally recognized tribes or 197 Alaskan village communities.[33] Urban Indians are generally not included in the BIA count.[34]

On the other hand, the Bureau of the Census uses self-identification to identify American Indians. The 1980 census reported 1,366,676 American Indians in the United States.[35] An additional 56,367 Eskimos and Aleuts, located primarily in Alaska, were also included in the 1980 census. Although the total figure of 1,423,043 represented less than 1 percent of the total U.S. population of 226,545,805, it is still a 72 percent increase over the 1970 census figure. The rapid growth in ten years is due in part to a high birthrate, but is also attributable to the Census Bureau's improved methods of counting American Indians. Even with this increase, many tribes feel their population figures are higher; there are some estimates of two million American Indians in this country. Also, because American Indians are a relatively young population, with a median age of 22.9 compared to the total U.S. median age of 30.0,[36] an even larger potential for growth exists.

TABLE 2

AMERICAN INDIAN POPULATION BY YEAR

Census Year	Population	Percent Increase From Previous Decade	States With Largest Population—Ranked
1980	1,366,679	72.4	Cal., Okla., Ariz., N.M., N.Car.
1970	792,730	51.4	Okla., Ariz., Cal., N.M., N.Car.
1960	523,591	46.5	Ariz., Okla., N.M., Cal., N.Car.

Sources: U.S. Bureau of the Census, *Census of the Population: 1980*, Supplementary Report PC80-S1-13, "American Indian Areas and Alaskan Native Villages: 1980" (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1984), Table A, p. 2, and Table 1, p. 14; U.S. Bureau of the Census, *Census of Population: 1970*, Subject Reports, Final Report PC(2)-1F, "American Indians" (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1973), Table II, p. xi; and U.S. Bureau of the Census, *Census of Population: 1960*, Subject Reports, Final Report PC(2)-1C, "Nonwhite Population by Race" (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1963), Table 10, pp. 12-15.

As Table 2 also reports, California had more American Indians than any other state in 1980. Five states, California (198,275), Oklahoma (169,292), Arizona (152,498), New Mexico (107,338) and North Carolina (64,536) accounted for 50.6 percent of the total Indian population.[37]

The 1980 census identified 278 federal and state reservations, with eleven states containing five or more reservations. One-fourth of all American Indians (339,836) lived on reservations, with Arizona having the largest reservation population (113,763), followed by New Mexico (61,876). It is interesting to note that non-Indians make up about 51 percent of the total reservation population in the United States. The Navajo have the largest reservation; they also have the largest population (104,978).[38]

Five metropolitan areas were identified as having an Indian population of 20,000 or more. They are the Los Angeles-Long Beach, California area with 48,158; Tulsa, Oklahoma with 38,498; Oklahoma City, Oklahoma with 24,752; Phoenix, Arizona with 22,900; and Albuquerque, New Mexico with 20,788. [39]

The 1980 census also identified American Indians in the historic areas of Oklahoma, excluding urban areas. These include areas which were reservations during the period from 1900 to 1907. A total of 121,108 Indians lived in this area, including those on the Osage Reservation.[40]

Economic Data

The 1980 census reported the unemployment rate for American Indians was twice that of the total U.S. population; 13.0 and 6.5 percent respectively. (The 1970 rates were 11.1 percent for American Indians and 4.4 for the general population.) The median family income for American Indian families in 1980 was $13,678; for Eskimo families, $13,829; and for Aleut families, $20,313. On the Navajo reservation the median family income in 1979 was $8,397. These figures compare to the national median family income of $19,917. The poverty rate for American Indians was 27.5 percent compared to 12.4 percent for the total U.S. population. The poverty rate for individuals on the Rosebud and Navajo reservations was 51.4 and 52.4 percent respectively.[41]

As noted above, the economic situation on reservations is much worse. A recent investigation by the *Arizona Republic* newspaper found that

> Indian reservations still lead the nation in indicators of despair. For example, it's not uncommon for a reservation's unemployment rate to exceed 80 percent. On many reservations, the only Indians with jobs are those who work for the tribe or the federal government.

> The Indian unemployment rate, the highest for any minority in America, is decried by U.S. Senators familiar with Indian issues. Sen. Daniel Inouye, D-Hawaii, chairman of the Senate Select Committee on Indian Affairs, calls unemployment on reservations a "national disgrace." Sen. John McCain, R-Ariz., compares economic conditions on Indian reservations to those in Third World countries: "The employment that there is—and this is why the statistics lie so much—is provided by the federal government or by the tribal governments themselves. There is no economic enterprise to provide meaningful jobs which make people move up on the economic ladder."[42]

As part of their investigative study, the *Arizona Republic* asked a national sample of 450 American Indians a series of questions. As the results in Table 3 indicate, unemployment was considered the second greatest problem facing Indians today. Moreover, additional questions revealed that 39 percent of the sample felt that, socially and economically, Indians are in about the same condition as they were ten years ago. Nearly 30 percent felt Indians were worse off than they were ten years ago.[43]

TABLE 3
WHAT IS THE GREATEST PROBLEM FACING INDIANS TODAY? (N = 450)

Problem	Total Percent
Alcohol/Drug Abuse	43.3
Unemployment	36.0
Education	16.4
Cultural Loss	14.9
Termination/Sovereignty Threats	10.9
Health Care	10.4
Housing	6.0
Teen Pregnancy	1.8
Suicide	1.8
Other Problems	3.6
All of the Above	12.2

Source: "Fraud in Indian Country: A Billion-Dollar Betrayal," *The Arizona Republic* (October 11, 1987).

Social Data

The 1980 census presented some interesting social data.[44] For example, 55.8 percent of the housing units on reservations with an American Indian, Eskimo or Aleut householder or spouse had no telephone. An amazing 87.3 percent of the housing units on the Papago Reservation in Arizona had no phone, as well as 83.4 percent of the homes on the San Carlos Apache Reservation in Arizona. Other data concerning housing units on reservations included:

- 15.9 percent of the housing units were without electric lighting. The percentage was 47.1 on the Hopi reservation.
- 16.6 percent did not have a refrigerator. The percentage was 46.9 on the Navajo reservation.
- 20.8 percent had an outhouse or privy. The percentage was 55.5 on the Hopi and 53.5 on the Papago reservations.
- 38.8 percent had more than 1.01 persons per room. The percentage was 65 for the Navajo and 58.8 for the Hopi reservations.

As Table 3 indicates, one could go on to discuss alcohol and drug abuse, health care, housing, teen pregnancy, suicide, or any other social, economic or political indicator. Chances are the data would present a picture similar to the one shown above. American Indians are at the bottom, with those living on reservations at the very bottom. But rather than discussing these areas, our attention here is on education. Education is seen as a critical area and often identified as the

means to change the kind of bleak economic and social conditions cited here.

The education of American Indians is complex and difficult to understand given the diversity in tribes, the state and tribal approaches to education, and the different federal programs that benefit Indian students. It is hard to specifically identify critical issues, since there are so many concerns in Indian education, tending to vary in importance from state to state, tribe to tribe, community to community, and/or school to school. There are issues associated with teaching and learning, characteristics of successful students, testing, control and governance, funding, research, higher education and leadership. The discussion here will be limited to the issues of responsibility for Indian education, teaching Indian students, education on and off reservations, and higher education.

Responsibility for Indian Education

Who has responsibility for the education of American Indians? Is it the federal government or the states? Or, is there a shared responsibility? In 1976 the American Indian Policy Review Commission (AIPRC) reported that state departments of education were asked two questions: What is the state's role in the education of Indian children? And, what is the federal government's role in the education of Indian children? The responses to these questions were:

> The overwhelming majority of those states responding to the question concerning the state's role in the education of Indian children indicated that the state's role was no different for Indian children than for all other children. In a typical reply, the respondent from Colorado said, "The state has the same responsibility for Indian children as any other child."
>
> In regard to the question concerning the Federal Government's role in the education of Indian children, nearly all respondents indicated that they viewed the Federal Government only as a funding agency.[45]

The Education Commission of the States, in discussing the involvement and relationships between federal, state and tribal governments, reported that conflict does exist:

> For instance, state laws and regulations often clash with federal directives and sometimes prevent either entity from effectively serving Indian children. Conflict and confusion, moreover, sometimes arise from how the various entities—the federal government, the state and the tribe—define who is an Indian. Determin-

> ing who qualifies as an Indian raises questions of program duplication, program eligibility, fiscal entitlement and program accountability. Local school districts sometimes find it very difficult to determine what funding they are entitled to. Many of them also do not apply for funding that could aid Indian children, simply because they do not believe that the paper work and consultation with Indian parent committees are worth the amount of added funding they would receive.[46]

In spite of the conflict and the strong tie to the federal government, there is increasing evidence that the states are assuming more responsibility, at least in practice, in the education of Indian students:

- The number of BIA students and schools have decreased significantly over the past ten years.
- Over 80 percent of the Indian students in schools are enrolled in public schools.
- The BIA continues to promote public education and recently proposed that their schools be turned over to tribes or to the states.
- In 1978 Congress mandated that the BIA develop and implement educational standards for their schools. The states in which BIA schools are located directly or indirectly influence the standards since teachers and academic programs have to be certified at the state level.
- State departments of education have become very active in the education of Indian students. Arizona, Oregon, New Mexico, Wyoming, Washington, Oklahoma, Michigan, Montana, California, North Dakota, South Dakota, Utah, North Carolina, Wisconsin and Minnesota all have very active units at the state level.
- During its tenure, the Reagan administration placed emphasis on states' rights, including an increased role at the state level and a decreased role at the federal level.
- Finally, the national reform movement in education has brought attention to education with specific actions which have taken place in state legislatures around the country. Focus has been on the states and their plans to address quality and excellence in education.

A related concern is the future of BIA education. This could be discussed as a separate issue, but because state public school systems stand to gain Indian students, it is presented here as part of the federal-state responsibility debate.

As has already been noted, the BIA proposed, as a 1988 initiative, transferring all BIA schools to local public school districts if tribes did

not take over their operation. The BIA's proposal stems from the substandard education received in its schools and the feeling that Indian students would be better served in public schools.

There was a tremendous amount of opposition from tribes, Indian educators and others to the BIA's proposal. Several reasons were given against the transfer. First, the transfer of BIA education to public schools or even to tribes would violate the federal government's trust responsibility for Indian education. Second, the BIA did not consult with the tribes about the proposed transfer of schools. Third, the proposed transfer would place the tribes in a difficult position of assuming control of BIA schools before they were ready and with no assurance that tribes already had or would receive adequate resources to operate the schools. Finally, the BIA offered no evidence that Indian students would actually do better in public or tribal schools. Furthermore, there was no assurance that parents or tribal leaders would have any say in how their students were educated in public schools.[47]

The concern about the transfer resulted in a provision in P.L. 100-297 noted earlier, prohibiting the BIA from transferring the operation of any BIA-funded school or substantially curtailing any program at such a school without permission of the appropriate tribal governing body. Thus, Congress has stopped the transfer of BIA schools to public schools for the moment.

However, in April 1988 the BIA released its *Report on BIA Education: Excellence in Indian Education Through the Effective School Process.*[48] The document was a result of a request by Congress in the 1987 appropriations process for a comprehensive education plan (CEP) from the BIA. The report was billed as a new effort to prepare a CEP, but was not called a CEP "because it does not attempt to plan comprehensively or answer all the future questions that may be important to the future of Indian students attending BIA schools."[49] Rather, the report provided information and presented options for review in order to facilitate the resolution of these broader issues.

There are three main sections to the report. The first section addressed the current condition of BIA education. In the second section, the BIA proposed to improve their schools by implementing the characteristics of "effective" schools. The "effective school" movement is based on research, some conducted with American Indians, identifying the key characteristics that work in schools, e.g., high expectations of students, a clear sense of mission and purpose, strong leadership at the level of the school principal, emphasis on learning the basic skills, holding students academically accountable, providing a safe and orderly learning environment, and involving parents and the local community

in the educational process. The third area of the report presented five possible alternatives for the future of BIA education. They were:

- Replacing BIA-administered education with tribal systems of education.
- Transferring BIA schools to public school districts.
- Individually-contracted BIA schools.
- Individual education vouchers.
- A revitalized BIA education system.

A recent survey of Indian educators asked the question, "Should the Bureau of Indian Affairs turn over its education function to the tribes and states?" Fifty percent of the sample said "yes" and 50 percent said "no." [50] Given these mixed opinions, a reasonable approach, supported by many tribes, might be that the BIA remain in the education business by revitalizing its system and moving toward a gradual process of providing adequate resources for tribes to assume control of BIA schools. The key factor is a legal concern as to the federal trust responsibility for Indian education. The BIA is viewed as the federal agency that has the trust responsibility for Indian education. Unless there are guaranteed assurances that the trust responsibility for education will transfer to other agencies, especially public schools, there is no chance that tribes will support the elimination of BIA education.

Thus, responsibility for Indian education remains a difficult and confusing issue. It remains a shared responsibility, with over 80 percent of all Indian students attending public elementary and secondary schools, and with the federal government providing supplemental funds to public education while simultaneously operating a national BIA school system. It appears this shared responsibility will continue indefinitely because Indian tribes and other constituencies will likely resist any efforts by the federal government to relinquish its legal responsibility for the education of Indian people.

Teaching Indian Students: A Conflict in Values and Approaches

A criticism throughout the history of Indian education has been that the education Indian students receive is not relevant or does not meet their needs. Teachers, methods of teaching, curriculum and materials, school types, student achievement and parental involvement have all been subject to criticism within this context.

As noted earlier, a central issue is how education is defined, operationalized and used in our society. Formal education in schools, with a

set curriculum and a teacher in charge, was foreign to the way American Indians learned prior to European contact. However, the educational system and its formal approach were recognized early in the history of this country as the means to change the American Indian—to assimilate the Indian into the white man's way of living.

The issues of relevancy and need are generally focused in areas of culture, including language, and academics, usually basic skills development. These two areas are closely related, but have not always been used together to promote learning. Prior to the 1930s and during the 1940s and 1950s, the culture of American Indians was viewed as an impediment to assimilation via education. The practice in schools was neither to recognize nor use the culture and language of American Indians in the learning process. In fact, both their culture and language were openly degraded and considered inferior, causing Indian students to feel ashamed of their heritage.

From the 1930s until the start of World War II, and again from the 1960s to the present, the culture and language of American Indians have received some recognition and respect in the schools. However, since the degree of recognition and respect varies according to time, place and, often, individual leadership, the acknowledged importance of American Indian culture and language in the learning process has not been consistent.

Today there are opposite forces working, each gaining momentum, that will help determine what happens in the future. First, the recent educational reform movement in the United States has focused on academic achievement, higher standards, testing, and common standardized approaches to solving educational problems. Reform has not emphasized individual and group differences. This is especially true for the American Indian, who for various reasons has not been recogized by a vast majority of the reform reports. Yet, American Indians are affected by what is happening. Indian educators were recently asked, "What impact has this national reform movement had on the education of American Indians?" They responded as follows: 14.3 percent said there was "no impact"; 30.4 percent said "little impact"; 33.9 percent indicated "some impact"; 14.3 percent said "significant impact"; and 7.1 percent did not know.[51]

The high response level for "no impact" and "little impact" may reflect the fact that the education of American Indians has received little attention in the reform reports, as well as the feeling that the education of Indian students takes place in isolation from education in general in this country. Regardless, the educational reform movement is making its presence felt in Indian education. An example is the change in focus of Title IV, Indian Education Act programs. Like edu-

cation in general, Title IV has shifted its focus from cultural areas to academics, usually the basic skills, with emphasis on student achievement and program accountability.

On the other hand, Vera John,[52] Susan Philips,[53] Arthur More[54] and Karen Swisher and Donna Deyhle[55] have all shown that the culture of American Indians affects how they learn in our schools. According to these studies, many American Indian students prefer learning styles that are different from the way most educators usually teach students in our society.

What does all of this mean? Surprisingly, it is not commonly accepted that culture and language make a difference in how students learn. In fact, there appears to be a belief among some educators that students are students and should be treated the same regardless of cultural background. Only in areas where there are large numbers of American Indian students, or where individual educators of Indian students promote different learning and teaching styles, is it likely that the pedagogical approach will be culturally sensitive. Otherwise, American Indian students continue to experience difficulties with the educational process.

Reservation vs. Off-Reservation Education

Is there a difference between the type of education American Indian students receive on reservations compared to that received off reservations?[56] If so, what is the difference? In general terms, key differences between reservation and off-reservation schools are:

- Reservation schools tend to have a higher percentage of Indian students in the student body of each school. They are thus very visible. In many of the off-reservation schools, especially those in urban areas, this is not the case. Indian students are often a numerical minority. lost in the crowd, and recognized only by supplemental programs like Title IV, Chapter I, or bilingual education.

- Reservation schools tend to serve a more homogeneous group of Indian students, usually from one tribe, that are more likely to speak their tribal language and practice their tribal culture. Off-reservation schools, on the other hand, are more likely to serve students from many tribes, a large number of whom will have limited knowledge and involvement in their tribal language and culture.

- The above has important implications for teaching and learning. Contract or tribal schools, as alternatives to BIA, public and mission education, are more likely to emphasize tribal language and culture in the educational process. This is also true for a number of public and BIA schools that are on reservations.
- Reservations will likely have four systems of education—BIA schools, contract or tribal schools, public schools and mission schools—operating near one another. Off-reservation areas will also have a mixture of public and private schools, but not including BIA schools and contract or tribal schools.
- Reservation schools will generally have a closer tie to the tribe and federal government. Tribal activities in education are more likely to influence reservation schools. The presence of the federal government is felt more in the total operation of the school, especially in BIA and contract or tribal schools, than in public schools, although public schools on reservations also feel the federal government's presence, especially in funding.
- Reservation schools also tend to have a stronger relationship with the parents and community being served. In all reservation schools, it is more likely to find American Indians serving on school boards and other institutional means for parental involvement, e.g., PTAs, parent committees, etc., than in off-reservation schools.

The above differences have an impact on the kind of education that is delivered and the perceptions or attitudes about the quality of education on and off the reservation. There appears to be a prevailing attitude that the quality of education on the reservation is not as good as education off the reservation. There are a number of factors that contribute to this thinking:

- The economic, social and health conditions on reservations are in a depressed state. In such situations education is, first, lower in priority for both tribal governments and individuals and, second, required to cope with economic, social and health situations that affect student learning.
- For a variety of reasons, it is difficult for the schools on reservations to recruit and retain effective teachers, administrators and other school professionals; to construct and maintain school facilities; and to obtain the necessary funds to support high-cost items associated with reservation education.
- Since Indians are so visible in schools on reservations, their educational problems may be magnified. It may not be that off-reserva-

tion schools, especially urban schools, are doing a better job; it might just be that Indians are almost invisible because of their low numbers. Or it may be that many Indian students who attend off-reservation schools are so much more assimilated or further from their culture that they are doing better in American schools.

A 1985 evaluation of Indian-controlled schools found that on the average, eighth-grade students in Indian-controlled schools were not scoring as well on achievement tests in reading and math as were students in public and BIA schools.[57] Also, twelfth-grade students in Indian-controlled schools scored better in reading, math and science than twelfth graders in BIA schools, but not as well as twelfth graders in public schools. According to the author of the evaluation, the findings were not surprising to representatives of Indian-controlled schools, who faulted the test design for comparing achievement test scores. They would have preferred a longitudinal study comparing current and past student performances.[58]

From the perspective of integrating tribal language and culture into the curriculum and treating them as strengths in the learning process, certain reservation schools are probably doing a better job of educating Indian students. Bicultural-bilingual education is practiced more in contract or tribal schools than in BIA, public or mission schools.

It is clear that the education of Indian students differs according to whether it occurs on or off reservation. However, the situations are very complex and gross generalizations should be avoided. In any event, both reservation and off-reservation schools have many concerns which make educational goals difficult to achieve.

American Indians and Higher Education

Are American Indians attending schools of higher education and obtaining degrees? In what fields? Are colleges and universities preparing more American Indian teachers, school administrators and counselors?

A study by the Center for Education Statistics reported two trends that should result in more American Indians enrolling in colleges and universities. First, the number of Indians between the ages of eighteen and twenty-four, considered college age, more than doubled from 1970 to 1980. And second, the percentage of American Indians who graduated from high school increased from 51 percent in 1970 to 60 percent in 1980.[59]

The number of American Indians in undergraduate education increased to 88,000 in 1982, compared to 76,000 in 1976. However, the number decreased by 5.7 percent to 83,000 in 1984.[60] A recent study by

the U.S. Department of Education reported that there were 84,000 American Indians in undergraduate school in 1986.[61] Most of these students, 86.6 percent in 1984, were enrolled in public colleges and universities; the remainder (13.4 percent) attended private schools. Among those in two-year institutions, more Indians were enrolled in public institutions—52.7 percent in 1986.[62] Thirty percent of the American Indians who entered two-year colleges in 1983 later transferred to four-year institutions. In 1984, American Indians represented 0.7 percent of the total undergraduate enrollment, but only 0.3 percent of the total graduate enrollment, meaning a cumulative loss of American Indians as they advanced through the educational pipeline.[63]

In 1976, more American Indians (23.1 percent) received bachelor's degrees in education than in any other field. By 1984 the emphasis had shifted, with science and technology (26.6 percent of the degrees) and business (24.9 percent) leading all other fields; only 14.2 percent of the degress were in education.[64]

There is some cause for optimism when considering the above data. However, in reality, the dropout rate among American Indians in colleges and universities is extremely high. A major issue for many institutions is the retention of those Indian students who have been admitted.

Of particular concern is the number of American Indians preparing to be educators. The number of American Indians receiving education degrees decreased from 765 in 1976 to 527 in 1984.[65] In addition, American Indians represent 0.9 percent of all the students in public schools, but only 0.6 percent of the teachers.[66] This gap can only widen if the number of Indian students continues to increase while the number of Indian teachers decreases.

Why are there not more American Indians entering teaching? When American Indians first started attending colleges and universities, it was common practice to major in education. After all, schools were very visible and represented opportunities for employment in home communities. During the 1960s and 1970s Indian education was criticized often, with teachers receiving part of the blame for the failure of Indian education. A way to improve Indian education was to train and employ more Indian teachers. Opportunities increased for American Indians to major in education. As the 1970s gave way to the 1980s, however, American Indians, like many other young people, looked toward other fields that provided more opportunity, more money, and a greater degree of respect and professionalism—namely, the fields of engineering and business.

There currently appears to be a renewed interest in education as a major. However, teacher education programs at colleges and universities and state certification requirements have changed over the past

five years as a result of the national reform movement in education. Admission standards to teacher education programs have changed, becoming more rigid and dependent on the successful completion of mandatory competency exams like the Pre-Professional Skills Test (PPST) or the National Teachers Examination (NTE). An immediate result is that fewer minorities, including American Indians, have been admitted into teaching. A high failure rate among American Indians also discourages potential education majors before they have a chance to start. Many states also require the passing of mandatory competency exams before certification can be granted. American Indians, like blacks and Hispanics, pass at a much lower rate than whites, resulting in even fewer teachers.

This situation has received a lot of attention lately, with a number of research studies in progress analyzing why minorities are faring poorly on these standardized competency tests.[67] Also, colleges and universities are evaluating their set of admission criteria and their relevance to minority students.

Future Direction

If history is an indicator, the quality of education that American Indians experience will continue to be fragmented, divisive and piecemeal in nature because of the complex differences in Indian education. At all levels, advocates of self-determination will focus on politics and the mechanics of control rather than on the teaching and learning process in the classroom. The BIA will continue to operate schools, facing criticism about the way they educate students, but receiving support when the concept of federal trust responsibility for education is threatened or challenged, as with proposals for the elimination of BIA education. Tribal schools will continue to provide an alternative approach that will focus on bilingual-bicultural education, but will be plagued by limited resources. Public education involvement and activity will increase as the enrollment of Indian students increases.

However, there are some trends that suggest or provide an opportunity for change. First, the national reform movement in education has recently focused attention on "at risk" or "disadvantaged" students. Since many American Indian students fall into these categories, one can be hopeful that greater emphasis will be placed on relevant and quality education for Indian students. A second trend is the promotion of early childhood education. Head Start programs work, and the federal government is being encouraged to increase their funding levels. The point is that the young, the very young, are the key to American

Indians achieving educational equity and social justice. Efforts to provide a meaningful and quality education, including a bicultural and/or bilingual approach, will return dividends in the long run.

The third area is the increasing recognition that education cannot function in isolation from society at large. Economic, social and political issues directly affect education and must be included in attempts to address problems. Schools must enter into partnerships with other institutions, agencies and various interest groups, in both the public and private sectors, to be effective in educating students. This is especially true for Indian education where there is a tendency, because of tribal and school differences or because of the special relationship with the federal government, to view education in isolation from various other public, private and tribal agencies.

As has been noted, states have been increasing their activity in Indian education during the past decade and will continue to do so in the future. In fact, the potential for greater state involvement is very real as the federal government, including the BIA, continues the policy of promoting public school education for Indian students. It is conceivable that the BIA, in its efforts to reduce its educational responsibility, will turn over schools to the tribes before many tribes are ready or have adequate resources to guarantee success. Without tribal readiness or sufficient resources, there is a danger that failure will occur in the process of tribes assuming control. In the long run, this may translate into state control of Indian education. The probability of this happening can be avoided if tribes deal with the federal government and increase their involvement with the states.

Another area that is likely to influence the future education of American Indians is research. Although there is not an abundance of research being conducted right now, educators and policymakers have a greater interest in both conducting and using research. There will continue to be evaluations, need assessments, feasibility studies and task force reports to justify budgets, program growth and legislative efforts. Together with research in teaching and learning, the quality of the classroom experience for Indian students should be enhanced.

There is reason to be cautiously optimistic about the future of Indian education in the United States, but it will take a broader approach. This approach should include a partnership among tribes, states, the federal government and other interest groups that will provide leadership and minimize politics while maximizing quality education for Indian students.

NOTES

[1]A discussion about the role of education in our society is found in Daniel Selakovich, *Schooling in America* (New York: Longman, 1984). Of particular interest is the discussion about Marxism, class conflict theory and the structural functional approaches to educational research.

[2]Ernest Boyer, "How Not to Fix Schools," *Harper's* (February 1987): 39-51.

[3]The term "American Indian" includes American Indians, Eskimos, Aleuts, and other Alaska Natives.

[4]U.S. Senate, *Indian Education: A National Tragedy — A National Challenge*, Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, Special Subcommittee on Indian Education (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1969).

[5]Detailed descriptive histories of Indian education can be found in the American Indian Policy Review Commission, *Report on Indian Education* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1976); U.S. Senate, op. cit. note 4; and Margaret Connell Szasz, *Education and the American Indian: The Road to Self-Determination Since 1928* (Albuquerque, NM: University of New Mexico Press, 1974).

[6]Lewis Meriam, technical director, et al., *The Problem of Indian Administration*, the Meriam Report (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins Press, published for the Brookings Institution 1928), pp. 140-148.

[7]American Indian Policy Review Commission, op. cit. note 5, p. 30.

[8]U.S. Senate, op. cit. note 4, pp. 31-32.

[9]Johnson-O'Malley Act of 1934, 48 Stat. 596, April 16, 1934 (73rd Congress, 2nd Session).

[10]Bureau of Indian Affairs, *Indian News, Week-in-Review* (Washington, D.C.: Bureau of Indian Affairs, March 23, 1987).

[11]Meriam Report, op. cit. note 6.

[12]William A. Brophy and Sophie D. Aberle, *The Indian: America's Unfinished Business* (Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press, 1966).

[13]U.S. Senate, op. cit. note 4.

[14]Robert J. Havighurst, *The Education of Indian Children and Youth. Summary Report and Recommendation: National Study of American Indian Education. Series IV, No. 6* (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago, 1970).

[15]American Indian Policy Review Commission, op. cit. note 5.

[16]U.S. Senate, op. cit. note 4.

[17]U.S. National Commission on Excellence in Education, *A Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform: A Report to the Nation and the Secretary of Education* (Washington, D.C.: The Commission, 1983).

[18]National Education Association, American Indian/Alaska Native Concerns Study Committee, . . . *And Justice For All: Report of the American Indian/Alaska Native Concerns Study Committee* (Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1987).

[19]John W. Tippeconnic III, *Education Reform Reports and the American Indian*, unpublished paper (1988).

[20]Robert J. Havighurst, "Indian Education: Accomplishments of the Last Decade," *Phi Delta Kappan* 62: 5 (January 1981): 329-331. The number of American Indians actually in school depends on what definition of Indian is used and who is doing the counting. There are some estimates of over 500,000 students in school. As indicated earlier, gathering accurate and consistent data continues to be a problem in assessments of American Indian education. The Bureau of Indian Affairs, the Department of Education, and the U.S. Census Bureau are sources of often conflicting data.

[21]Havighurst, ibid.

[22]Center for Education Statistics, *The Condition of Education* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1986).

[23]U.S. Department of Education, *Trends in Minority Enrollment in Higher Education* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education, 1988), cited in "Minorities' Share of College Enrollments Edges Up, as Number of Asian and Hispanic Students Soars," *Chronicle of Higher Education* (March 9, 1988), pp. A33-A36.

[24]Bureau of Indian Affairs, *United States Department of the Interior Budget Justification, FY 1986* (Washington D.C.: Bureau of Indian Affairs, 1985).

[25]U.S. Bureau of the Census, *1980 Census of Population*, Subject Reports, Vol. 2, PC80-2-1D, Part 2, "American Indians, Eskimos, and Aleuts on Identified Reservations and in the Historic Areas of Oklahoma (Excluding Urbanized Areas)," (hereafter cited as *Census 1986*) (Washington, D.C.: U.S Government Printing Office, 1986), Table 7, pp. 50, 54.

[26]Ibid., p. 50; and U.S. Bureau of the Census, *Statistical Abstract of the United States 1991*, (hereafter cited as *Statistical Abstract 1991*) (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1990), Table 43, p. 38, and Table 44, p. 39.

[27]*Statistical Abstract 1991*, ibid.

[28]Center for Education Statistics, op. cit. note 22.

[29]Center for Education Statistics, *The American Indian in Higher Education, 1975-76 to 1984-85* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1987).

[30]Alec M. Gallup and David L. Clark, "The 19th Annual Gallup Poll of the Public's Attitudes Toward the Public Schools," *Phi Delta Kappan* 69: 1 (September 1987): 17-30.

[31]John W. Tippeconnic III, *Survey: Education of American Indians*, unpublished data (1988). Also, see John W. Tippeconnic III, "A Survey: Attitudes Toward the Education of American Indians," *Journal of American Indian Ed-*

ucation 28: 1 (October 1988): 34-36, for some of the major findings of the survey.

[32]Ibid.

[33]The Bureau of Indian Affairs, Bureau of the Census, and Department of Education have different definitions of "American Indian." The BIA's definition is that an individual must be a member of a tribe, band or group of Indians recognized by the federal government, and for some purposes, be of one-fourth or more Indian blood. The Census Bureau uses a self-identification method in counting American Indians. The Department of Education implements Title IV, the Indian Education Act of 1972. Title IV's definition is an individual who is a descendant, either in the first or second degree, of a member of an American Indian tribe. The definition of "American Indian" is a very political issue today, in part because resources, through eligibility requirements, are allocated according to the number of American Indians. However, it is recognized that tribes have the right to define conditions for their own tribal membership.

[34]Bureau of Indian Affairs, *American Indians: U.S. Indian Policy, Tribes and Reservation, BIA: Past and Present, Economic Development* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1984).

[35]U.S. Bureau of the Census, *1980 Census of Population*, Supplementary Report PC80-S1-13, "American Indian Areas and Alaska Native Villages: 1980," (hereafter cited as *Census 1984*) (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing, 1984), Table A, p. 2, and Table 1, p. 14; and U.S. Bureau of the Census, *Census of Population: 1970*, Subject Reports, Final Report PC(2)-1F, "American Indians" (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1973), Table II, p. xi.

[36]Ibid.; *Statistical Abstract 1991*, op. cit. note 26, Table 22, p. 18.

[37]*Census 1984*, op. cit. note 35, p. 3.

[38]Ibid., Table L, p. 11.

[39]U.S. Bureau of the Census, *1980 Census of Population*, Supplementary Report PC80-S1-5, "Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas and Standard Consolidated Statistical Areas: 1980," Table 1, pp. 6-46.

[40]*Census 1984*, op. cit. note 35, Table G, p. 4.

[41]*Census 1986*, op. cit. note 25, Table 10, pp. 81-82; *Statistical Abstract 1991*, op. cit. note 26, Table 44, p. 39; and U.S. Bureau of the Census, *1980 Census of Population*, Vol. 1, Characteristics of the Population, PC80-1-C1, Ch. C, "General Social and Economic Characteristics," Part 1, U.S. Summary (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1983), Table 73, pp. 1-11, Table 162, pp. 1-159, Table 164, pp. 1-161, and Table 165, pp. 1-162.

[42]"Fraud in Indian Country: A Billion-Dollar Betrayal," *The Arizona Republic* (October 11, 1987), p. 26.

[43]Ibid., p. 34.

[44]U.S. Bureau of the Census, op. cit. note 25. All the data presented in this section are from this source.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

[45]American Indian Policy Review Commission, op. cit. note 5, p. 137.

[46]Education Commission of the States, *Indian Education: Involvement of Federal, State and Tribal Governments, Report No. 135* (Denver, CO: Education Commission of the States, 1980), p. 54.

[47]Association on American Indian Affairs, Inc., *Indian Affairs* 113 (Spring 1987), a special issue of a newsletter on Indian education.

[48]Bureau of Indian Affairs, *Report on BIA Education: Excellence in Indian Education Through the Effective School Process* (Washington, D.C.: Bureau of Indian Affairs, March, 1988). The report is a final review draft that was used to obtain input from Indian educators prior to the final report.

[49]Ibid.

[50]Tippeconnic, *Survey*, op. cit. note 31.

[51]Ibid.

[52]Vera John, "Styles of Learning — Styles of Teaching: Reflections on the Education of Navajo Children," in Courtney Cazden, Dell Hymes and Vera John, eds., *Functions of Language in the Classroom* (New York: Teachers College Press, 1972), pp. 331-343.

[53]Susan Philips, *The Invisible Culture: Communication in Classrooms and on the Warm Springs Indian Reservation* (New York: Longman, 1983).

[54]Arthur J. More, "Native Indian Learning Styles: A Review for Researchers and Teachers," *Journal of American Indian Education* 27: 1 (October 1987): 17-29.

[55]Karen Swisher and Donna Deyhle, "Styles of Learning and Learning of Styles: Education Conflicts for American Indian/Alaskan Native Youth," *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 8: 4 (1987): 345-360.

[56]The discussion here is limited to federal reservations. It is recognized that some of the statements in this section may also apply to nonreservation areas that have high concentrations of American Indians, e.g., Oklahoma and Alaska.

[57]Abt Associates, Inc., *An Evaluation of Indian Controlled Schools* (Cambridge, MA: Abt Associates, Inc., 1985). This evaluation was prepared for the U.S. Department of Education. The document was considered a draft final report.

Indian-controlled schools include tribal or contract schools, usually located on reservations, which receive funding through contracts with the Bureau of Indian Affairs; they may also receive grants from the Department of Education. Indian-controlled schools also include schools that are not tribally operated, and may be located in urban areas, but are under the control of an Indian school board.

[58]Ibid.

[59]Center for Education Statistics, op. cit. note 29, p. 10.

[60]Shirley Vining Brown, *Minorities in the Graduate Education Pipeline*, a research report of the Minority Graduate Education (MGE) Project, jointly sponsored by the Graduate Record Examinations Board and the Educational Testing Service, Educational Testing Service, 1987.

[61]"Minorities' Share of College Enrollments," op. cit. note 23.

[62]Ibid., p. A35.

[63]Brown, op. cit. note 60, pp. 4-6.

[64]Ibid., p. 6.

[65]Ibid.

[66]American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, *Minority Teacher Recruitment and Retention: A Call for Action* (Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, September 1987), p. 3.

[67]See the "Special Section on Testing," *Phi Delta Kappan* 70: 9 (May 1989): 683-722. Seven articles are included in this section.